

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

NICOLE JENNIFER GETZ,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:18-cv-11625

HONORABLE STEPHEN J. MURPHY, III

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY,

Defendant.

_____ /

**ORDER ADOPTING
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [21], DENYING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT [17], AND
GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT [20]**

The Commissioner of the Social Security Administration ("SSA") denied the application of Plaintiff Nicole Jennifer Getz ("Getz") for Supplemental Security Income and Disability Insurance Benefits in a decision issued by an Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ"). *See* ECF 13 (transcript of social security proceedings). After the SSA Appeals Council declined to review the ruling, Getz appealed. The Court referred the matter to Magistrate Judge Elizabeth A. Stafford, and the parties filed cross-motions for summary judgment. ECF 4, 17, 20. The magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation ("Report") suggesting the Court deny Getz's motion and grant the Commissioner's motion. ECF 21.

Civil Rule 72(b) governs review of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation. De novo review of the magistrate judge's findings is required only

if the parties "serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Because neither party filed timely objections, de novo review of the Report's conclusions is not required. After reviewing the record, the Court finds that the magistrate judge's conclusions are factually based and legally sound. Accordingly, the Court will adopt the Report's findings, deny Getz's motion for summary judgment, and grant the Commissioner's motion for summary judgment.

ORDER

WHEREFORE, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation [21] is **ADOPTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment [17] is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment [20] is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this case is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

SO ORDERED.

s/Stephen J. Murphy, III
STEPHEN J. MURPHY, III
United States District Judge

Dated: June 27, 2019

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on June 27, 2019, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/David P. Parker
Case Manager